



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/096,684	06/12/98	FRAME	R 17659-016

TM11/1013
Fletcher, Yoder & Van Someren
P. O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

LAC, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 10/13/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/096,684

Applicant(s)

Robert Frame

Examiner

LAO, LUN - YI

Group Art Unit

2778

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-25-00
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2778

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 10-16, 18-24, 29, 30 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson et al(6,028,764).

As to claims 1, 11, 13, 30 and 35-40, Richardson et al teach a portable computer system comprising one or more battery connectors(60)(see figures 1, 7 and column 3, lines 18-27); a portable base computer(12) having a wireless receiver(70, 76); a processor(32) having a data input operatively connected to the wireless receiver and having a power input connected to one of the battery connectors(see figure 7; column 1, lines 11-15 and column 3, lines 18-30); mass storage(36 or 42) and a wireless transmitter(68, 74); and a portable user interface module(14) having a wireless receiver(70, 76); a display(18) for displaying a window having a data input connected to the wireless receiver(70, 76) and having a power input connected to one of the

Art Unit: 2778

battery connectors; a user interface device(54b) and a wireless transmitter(68, 74)(see figures 1, 7, 8; column 2, lines 61-68 and column 3, lines 1-43).

As to claims 1, 13, 21, 30 and 36, Richardson et al teach a first and a second wireless transmitter, a first and a second wireless receiver and an input device(touch input panel)(see 7-8; column 3, lines 4-15 and lines 32-49).

As to claims 12, 20 and 21, Richardson et al teach an user interface module comprising obstacle-tolerant wireless transmitter and receiver(radio communication, 82, 84)(see figure 9 and column 3, lines 50-57).

As to claims 2, 14, 22 and 33, Richardson et al teach a mechanical connector or mechanical docking connector(26, 28) for holding the base computer(12) in contact with the user interface module(14)(see figures 1-6 and column 2, lines 24-27).

As to claims 3, 4, 15, 16, 23, 24 and 33, Richardson et al teach an electrical connector(62) for electrically connecting the base computer(12) to the user interface module(14) and the electrical connector including bypass contacts operation(see figure 7 and column 3, lines 4-5).

As to claims 6, 18 and 19, Richardson et al teach a portable computer system comprising at least a portion of local area network connected between the processor(32) and a display(18)(see figures 7, 9 and column 3, lines 1-3 and lines 50-68, and column 4, lines 1-33).

As to claims 10, 29 and 34, Richardson et al teach the portable base computer(12) and the user interface module(14) having a same size.

Art Unit: 2778

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7-9, 17 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al(6,028,764) in view of Gee(5,619,396) and Martin et al(5,148,155).

Richardson et al fail to disclose a portable interface device comprising a 640X480 display, a pointing device, a keyboard with letter and ten decimal keys.

Gee teach a portable interface device(24) comprising a keyboard(46) which having a pointing device, letter and ten decimal keys(see figures 2, 4; column 3, lines 9-20 and lines 45-60). It would have been obvious to have modified Richardson et al with the teaching of Gee, so displaying information and inputting data to a processor could be performed in separate devices.

Martin et al teach a portable computer system comprising a 640X480 display for display a window, a pointing device(224) and a keyboard(222) with letter and ten decimal keys(see figures 1, 10, 11; column 5, lines 31-36; column 33, lines 28-37 and column 34, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to have modified Richardson et al with the teaching of Martin et al, since Richardson et al have disclose a display(18)(see figure 2 and column 3, lines 44-49), a 640X480

Art Unit: 2778

resolution display is well known in the art and a touch panel having a keyboard function could be make a device easier for people to use(see Martin's column 1, lines 61-63).

5. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al(6,028,764) in view of Dat(5,831,818).

Richardson et al fail to disclose the weight of the portable computer is under about nine pounds and the space of the portable computer is about two inches by nine inches by twelve inches.

Dat teaches the wight of the portable computer is about five pounds and the size of the computer is small(see figure 1; abstract and column 1, lines 7-13). It would have been obvious to have modified Richardson et al with the teaching of Dat, so as to easy carry .

It would have been an obvious design choice to make a portable computer is about two inches by nine inches by twelve inches, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237(CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2778

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Lun-yi, Lao at telephone
number (703) 305-4873.

October 3, 2000

Lun-Yi Lao
Lun-Yi Lao
Primary Examiner